



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/728,325

12/04/2003

Michael J. Sosnoski

1842.168US1

7348

21186

7590

03/26/2007

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

P.O. BOX 2938

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

HSU, RYAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|--|-----------|---------------|
|--|-----------|---------------|

3 MONTHS

03/26/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/728,325

Applicant(s)

SOSNOSKI ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan Hsu

Art Unit

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The current limitations are drawn towards a gaming machine for conducting a wagering game. However, the limitations currently recite a visual display and a panel to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference. Although a display and panel are elements of a gaming machine the current limitations fail to enable or describe a gaming machine that can conduct a wagering game. For example, the current claims directed towards a display can not actually conduct a wagering game on its own, a gaming machine requires input/outputs, a processor, and use various other essential components in order to have the ability of conducting a wagering game. Therefore, the current claims are incomplete for omitting essential elements pertinent to the applicant's claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-11, 13, 15-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wachi et al. (US 6,833,665 B2).

Regarding claim 1, Wachi et al. disclose a visual display and a panel mounted in front of the display and revealing at least a portion of the display (*see 'flat display panel main body' [1] and 'front protective glass plate' [3], col. 4: ln 28-col. 5: ln 5*), the panel being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference (*see 'electrically conductive layer', col. 2: ln 35-55*).

Regarding claim 2, 11, and 16, Wachi et al. disclose a machine wherein the panel is substantially transparent where the panel reveals the portion of the display (*see col. 2: ln 35-col. 3: ln 62*).

Regarding claim 6-7, 13, and 18-19, Wachi et al. disclose a display wherein the panel is comprised of glass (*see col. 2: ln 44-55*). Additionally, the panel is coated with a film containing indium tin oxide (*see col. 6: ln 10-col. 8: ln 32*).

Regarding claim 8, Wachi et al. disclose a display including a bezel encompassing the panel, the bezel being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference (*Fig. 1-3 and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claim 10, Wachi et al. disclose a panel for a gaming machine that conducts a wagering game, the panel being positioned in front of a visual display and revealing at least a portion of the display (*see 'flat display panel main body' [1] and 'front protective glass plate' [3], col. 4: ln 28-col. 5: ln 5*), the panel being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference (*see col. 2: ln 35-55*).

Art Unit: 3714

Regarding claim 15, Wachi et al. disclose an assembly for a gaming machine that conducts a wagering game, the assembly comprising: a panel positioned in front of a visual display of the machine and revealing at least a portion of the display (*see col. 4: ln 28-col. 5: ln 5*); and a bezel encompassing the panel, each of the panel and the bezel being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference (*see col. 2: ln 35-55*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 12, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wachi et al. as applied to claims above, and further in view of Takahashi et al. (US 6,884,936 B2).

Regarding claims 5, 12, and 17, Wachi et al. teaches a display that contains a layer that is coated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference. However, Wachi is silent with respect to the amount of shielding effectiveness for its display. In an analogous display patent, Takahashi et al. teaches a display shield film that is capable of reducing noise by a level of at least 7 dB (*see Fig. 22 and the related description thereof*). Takahashi teaches that one would be motivated to incorporate these type of electromagnetic shielding films into display devices in order to protect any harmful radiation that may be emitted from the display devices. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 3714

at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that although Wachi did not teach a reduction of noise by shielded screen it was a property that existed and that a 7 dB reduction was capable of being performed at the time the invention was made.

Claims 3-4, 9, and 20, Wachi et al. rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wachi et al. as applied to claims above, and further in view of Schneider et al. (US 6,089,976).

Regarding claims 3-4, 9, and 20, Wachi et al. teach a flat display panel with a front protection plate that implements a coated or impregnated conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference. However, Wachi is silent with respect to the implementation of its device in a gaming machine. However, Wachi does teach that the conductive layer may be incorporated in any device that requires a display device. In a related patent, Schneider et al. teaches gaming machine that incorporates a video display monitor for the operation of an interactive primary game and bonus game (*see abstract*). Schneider teaches a gaming machine as an entertainment machine that contains electro-mechanical symbol-bearing reels and a visual display that is adapted to display the wagering game (*see display [40] of Fig. 1 and the related description thereof*). Furthermore, Schneider teaches a gaming machine to have visible devices that are selected from a group consisting of a bill validator, a coin acceptor, a printer, a card reader, a card reader display, a secondary display (*see devices [20-25] of Fig. 1 and the related description thereof*). One would be motivated to incorporate the features of Schneider's gaming machine with that of Wachi's display in order to allow for the user of Schneider's gaming machine to be protected from electromagnetic radiation that would be

Art Unit: 3714

generated by the display devices required to play the game of Schneider. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schneider's gaming machine with Wachi's flat display panel to have a gaming machine for conducting a wagering game that had a display that would provide shielding from electromagnetic interference.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yoshikawa et al. (US 6,063,479) – Light Transmitting Electromagnetic-Wave Shielding Plate.

Yoshida et al. (US 6,621,003 B2) – Electromagnetic Radiation Shielding Material, a Method of Producing the Same and a Display Device Using the Same.

Ochiai et al. (US 6,078,139) - Front Panel for Plasma Display.

Tone et al. (US 6,686,536 B2) – Method of Forming Electrode Section on Inner Surface of Transparent Electromagnetic Wave Shielding Plate.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be direct to Ryan Hsu whose telephone number is (571)-272-7148. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert P Olszewski can be reached at (571)-272-6788.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 3714

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 1-866-217-9197 (toll-free).



RH



SCOTT JONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

March 5, 2007